

Application No. 09/676,186  
Amendment dated November 17, 2003  
Reply to Office Action dated July 16, 2003

Attorney Docket No. 026125-069  
Page 2 of 3

To support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every feature of the claimed invention must be shown in a single prior art document. Moreover, to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the cited documents must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. As discussed below, the claims positively recite limitations that are not disclosed nor suggested in the cited documents and are therefore not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited documents.

Applicants describe a method and system for executing secure data transfer between a communication device and an application server in a wireless network. Claim 1 recites, among other features, that the data signed by the signing application of the communication device is sent from the communication device to the security adapter, wherein the signature is verified for the data, and the verified signed data is sent to the server for execution of the transaction.

Vatenan discloses a method of secure session set-up between an application control server and a SIM-card connected to a terminal device. The Examiner contends that Vatenan discloses a method of establishing an agreement proposal for a secure transaction from the server to a security adapter connected to the network, activating a signaling application, and sending the signed data from the communication device to the security adapter. The Examiner further contends that the signature for the data is verified and the verified signed data is sent to the server for execution of the transaction (making reference to p. 3, ll. 10-25, p. 4, ll. 21-34, and Fig. 2). Applicants disagree.

With reference to Vatenan, page 4, lines 21-34, and in particular with reference to lines 29-34, "the right of access to the application is preferably verified in the application control server and, if valid access right exists, the special data needed in the application [in the mobile station], for example service description and application specific user interface codes, are sent [to the mobile station]." That is, verification does not take place until the data reaches the application control server. Vatenan fails to disclose or suggest verifying the data by the security adapter prior to and for transmission from the security adapter to the application server for execution of the transaction according to the claimed invention. In contrast, verification of the right of access to an application is performed in the application control server to obtain the special data needed in the application to be executed in the mobile station.

Application No. 09/676,186  
Amendment dated November 17, 2003  
Reply to Office Action dated July 16, 2003

Attorney Docket No. 026125-069  
Page 3 of 3

Using the Applicants' method and system, a higher level of security during data transfer is achieved for conventional WAP browsing. Moreover, the application in the SIM-card is greatly simplified, requiring less memory and other resources and allowing a thinner and more flexible design.


None of the other cited documents cures the deficiencies of Vatenan.

Accordingly, since the cited documents fail to disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations for at least the above reasons, both the anticipation and the obviousness rejections of the claims should be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe entry of this Amendment would put the application in condition for allowance. Thus, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered, and a Notice to this effect be provided. If any questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.


By:   
Theodosios Thomas  
Registration No. 45,159

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(919) 941-9240

Date: November 17, 2003

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent by facsimile transmission to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Arlington, VA 22313-1450 to the following facsimile number:

Facsimile Number: 703 872 9315  
Date of Transmission: November 17, 2003

  
Jennie Sneed